

**NEW FINDINGS ON THE NATURE OF ECONOMIC
AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION IN ENGLAND
AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR NEW
POLICY INITIATIVES**

Angela Brennan, John Rhodes and Peter Tyler

DISCUSSION PAPER NO 101

August 1998

CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	1
1 Introduction	3
2 The nature and extent of social exclusion	3
3 The nature of the new survey work	10
4 Selected survey results on the economic and social survey conditions in the selected local areas.	12
5 Drawing out the inter-relationships; the use of logistic analysis	26
6 Policy considerations	35
Annex : Survey methodology & Response Rates	47

Acknowledgement

This is a paper drawn from ongoing research into the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) Challenge Fund which is being undertaken in the Department of Land Economy in the University of Cambridge and which is financed by the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. It is led by Dr Peter Tyler and John Rhodes assisted by Angela Brennan. The evaluation team are tracking the progress and achievements of 20 SRB case studies over a period of eight years. In the period leading up to this interim report the evaluation team has reviewed the benefit of assistance guidance and advice from a large number of people.

The evaluation team also includes Wendy Russell and Steve Stevens based in the Department of Land Economy and Roger Tarling and Kate McEvoy from Cambridge Policy Consultants. The core research team has been assisted in the social survey aspects of the study by Mark Speed and Bobby Duffy from MORI and Mark Kleinman and Christine Whitehead from the London School of Economics.

The work was guided by a Steering Group from the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions which comprised Paul Evans, Mike Gahagan, Judith Littlewood, Lesley Smith (Nominated Officer Phase One), Gillian Smith, Sam Mason, Jane Todorovic (Nominated Officer Phase Two), Paul McCafferty, Stephen Aldridge, John Wallace, Debbie Butler and Fiona Cruickshank. Other members of the Steering Group included; Daniel Hulls (HM Treasury), Celia Dale (Home Office), Steve King (Department of Social Security), John Elliot (Department for Education and Employment), David Andrews (Department of Trade and industry), Robert Smith (Assistant Director Housing & Regeneration - GOEM) and Ralph Ward (Government Office for London).

Valuable assistance and comments were received from members of an Advisory Group which included; David McAlistair (Scottish Office), John Elliot (Department for Education and Employment), David Andrews (Department of Trade and Industry), Steve Dunn (Rural Development Commission), Ailsa Blair (ADC Economic Development, Tourism & Leisure), John Woodall (Chief Executive, Dudley TEC), Gabriel Chanan

(Community Development Foundation), June Dawes (Housing Corporation), Jill Goldsmith (National Audit Office), Joel O'Loughlin (Urban Forum), Cay Stratton (Business in the Community), Professor Peter Hall (University College London) and Richard Beattie (English Partnerships).

The research team would also like to acknowledge the extensive assistance given by the Government Offices for the Regions and also the following twenty case study partnerships without whose co-operation and help this research would not have been possible.

Any comments concerning this paper are very welcome and should be addressed to the Department of Land Economy (01223 337138 or 337149, fax 01223 337130 or e-mail pt23@cus.cam.ac.uk).

1 Introduction

There is considerable interest at the present time in understanding the problems presented by social exclusion in England and how policy might best tackle the problems which emerge. During the course of an evaluation of the achievements of the SRB a survey of the households in eight local areas in receipt of SRB support was carried out in order to reveal the economic and social problems in different types of area and the views of the people living there. Besides providing valuable baseline evidence from which to assess the eventual achievements of the SRB initiative the new survey evidence also allowed valuable insight into the nature of social exclusion in England.

2 The nature and extent of social exclusion

The term "social exclusion" was not in common use in the United Kingdom until the 1990s and it was hardly used at all in Government documents until May 1997 when the new Labour Government used the term widely and established a co-ordinating policy body known as the Social Exclusion Unit. The term was in regular use in the 1970s and 1980s within the European Commission. Its use was linked to the development of a European Social Fund (ESF). The aim of all initiatives with ESF were essentially concerned with addressing long term unemployment, but the term "social exclusion" rather than "labour market exclusion" was preferred because it was widely recognised that those who were long term unemployed frequently experienced a wide range of economic and social disadvantages including problems of numeracy and literacy, low personal and vocational skills, below average health and disadvantaged family circumstances in addition to below average incomes and poverty. The early thinking behind the European Social Fund was that this range of social problems had to be addressed through education, training and social projects in order that the socially excluded could enter the labour market and from there on could take advantage of economic opportunities which would prevent reversion to social exclusion and provide a self sustaining economic base for social inclusion. Assisting the socially excluded to reach a position of being able to re-enter the labour market and take full advantage of economic opportunities was always seen as the most promising route to social exclusion and this relationship between

social and economic actions lies at the heart of the recently introduced New Deal policy for the young unemployed, - i.e. improved economic opportunity is a favoured route out of social exclusion - even if this were mainly achieved by recycling lower skilled jobs to the socially excluded away from others who were slightly less deprived and disadvantaged.

Definition of social exclusion

A clear definition of social exclusion would be helpful, in estimating the numbers who were socially excluded, their needs and the specific features of policy actions which would be most effective in tackling the needs of the socially excluded. Considerable consultation activity and debate is currently taking place on such a definition.

Taking a very narrow definition of social exclusion would imply selecting groups of people with very specific exclusion difficulties - often caused by a physical or administrative exclusion barrier. Examples of such groups include ex-offenders coming out of prison, pupils excluded from school, and those who are homeless. The numbers in these groups at any one time may be quite small in relation to the population as a whole, although the problem is dynamic in so far as new ex-offenders, newly excluded pupils and the newly homeless appear each year to add to the stock. Moreover, if these were the only socially excluded part of the population their problems could be addressed by quite specific targeted policies concerned with reintegrating ex-offenders, difficult pupils and the homeless back into society.

Whilst such groups may contain some of the most severely socially excluded people they also have a range of social and economic problems which are shared by larger groups in the population. A critical issue for developing a wider definition of social exclusion is to decide what is the range of social and economic problems which would determine whether someone was socially excluded or not.

One recent wider definition suggested by the Government described social exclusion as "broadly covering those people who do not have the means, material or otherwise, to participate in social, economic political and cultural life." Implicit in this definition is that whilst many people may choose not to

be active in social, economic, political and cultural life there is another group in which individuals do not have a choice - they are prevented, involuntarily, from participating because they do not have the means to do so. Low incomes and poverty is suggested to be part of the barrier and this may arise for people excluded from the labour market for a host of reasons including lack of numeracy and literacy, low educational attainment, ill-health, lack of motivation and personal skills, age and the need to care for relatives who are young, old or infirm. People excluded from the labour market for such reasons are likely to be partly or wholly dependent on social security benefits for their income and consequently will have, in the main, relatively low incomes. Families on low incomes do not have a wide choice of housing tenure - only rented social housing is available to them whether the landlord is private, a Housing Association or a Local Authority. In practice many of the most deprived families live in Local Authority rented accommodation and tend to be allocated houses in the most run down estates in which units are both available and at relatively low rents.

Extent of social exclusion

If socially excluded families and individuals were spread evenly in local communities across the nation they would represent a relatively small minority of the population. For example in the 1991 Census of Population just under 10% of families were identified as multiply deprived and single parent families made up about 5% of households overall. More recently about 7% of all school leavers had no qualifications,. Up to 5% of the labour force are unemployed for over 6 months with perhaps as many out of the labour force classified as long term sick. About 15% of households were receiving Income Support. There is very considerable overlap between these groups so that the socially excluded are unlikely to exceed 10-15% of the population. Although this represents a small minority some 5 to 8 million people could be affected. If these were spread evenly through local communities mainstream programmes, locally delivered, could address minority deprivation problems of this magnitude.

Geographical incidence of social exclusion

In practice the geographical spread of deprivation is far from even. Prosperous smaller towns such as York, Harrogate, Guildford, St Albans and Cambridge have a below average incidence of deprivation whilst large single tenure estates in the inner cities and the outer fringes of the conurbation's have a very high incidence of deprivation. Just how high is shown below for some SRB partnership areas in England using social survey material carried out in a sample of SRB areas by MORI in 1997.

The latest survey evidence suggests these estates;

- have severe deprivation in breadth and depth
- All aspects of life are affected - educational attainment, crime and safety, housing, jobs, skills, the environment, incomes and health. Benefit dependency is very high, employment is low.

What distinguishes these areas is that a majority of the local community population are deprived - so that social exclusion is not so much a matter affecting individual households, but the whole area. Problems interact with each other, an adverse cumulative momentum builds up so that the area acquires a poor image and residents become resigned to the difficulties and tolerate what develops into a social exclusion culture - in which the area becomes dependent on the state for income but most people become excluded from participating in the wider society in the normal way.

Piecemeal addressing of particular problems is thwarted by interactive problems elsewhere. For example determined efforts to improve local schools and educational attainment do not seem to work well, particularly at secondary school level, because the socially excluded culture at home and on the estate as a whole is to be anti-education - or at least to discourage the disciplines which educational achievements require. There are strong tendencies, thereafter, for social exclusion to be inter-generational in a way in which it is not for individual families in more prosperous communities

The costs of social exclusion and its solution

Where whole estates of perhaps 20,000 people are affected in this way with severe multiple deprivation, they are more costly to cure than if deprivation was spread evenly. By the same token it becomes increasingly more costly to leave them excluded in terms of social security, police, and social service expenditure. Such public expenditures may provide some modest compensation for living in deprived circumstances, but the area stays increasingly dependent on state grants and sustainable solutions which provide a cure for deprivation without recourse to public expenditure are not secured.

Policy approvals

Hitherto the major Government departments which operate vertically from Whitehall to local communities have failed to operate with the flexibility and common purpose required to achieve comprehensive regeneration of such estates. Funding at the level is dictated by distribution formulae based more on demographic characteristics e.g. numbers of children rather than educational needs of children and it would be politically difficult to switch spending from areas with high educational attainment to areas with low attainment.

More recently Government departments are piloting new schemes to address problem areas/estates such as Employment Zones and Health Action Areas and so far these are being designed to improve inter-agency co-operation at the local level with a view to improving the up-take and efficiency of existing programmes being delivered into deprived estates/areas.

The other approach to addressing estate based social exclusion is through area comprehensive regeneration schemes which have been developed over many years by DETR in England and the Scottish Office. A variety of major policy initiatives have been deployed in distressed urban areas commencing with the Urban Programme, and including subsequently Urban Development Corporations, City Challenge and the SRB Challenge Fund in England and the New Life Partnerships and PPAs in Scotland. In recognition of the widespread economic social, housing and environmental problems of estates

these initiatives adopt a more comprehensive approach in attempting to deploy a variety of projects/programmes to address each aspect of regeneration. Such schemes sit uneasily with mainstream programmes and seek to improve co-ordination with a carrot of top-up funding.

Causes, effects and circulation

One problem in designing comprehensive regeneration schemes is that there is not clear evidence of the patterns of causes and effects which have led to geographically concentrated social exclusion.

The idea of a clear sequence of cause and effect is attractive to policy makers because they would then focus funding and action on the root cause of the social exclusion - the multiple manifestations of which would then be seen to fade away. Historically one of the main causes of the concentration of deprivation are geographical concentrations of single tenure social housing and particularly large tracts of high rise and tenement council estates. For some years now these have not been built and will not be built in the future but the legacy of the last five decades is substantial in terms of the large estates which remain. In practice new build is now more incremental, not single tenure and not high rise, so there will be a gradual move to more varied tenures.

Meanwhile it is probably not very useful to attempt to identify a pattern of causes and effects in areas of concentrated deprivation. The evidence presented in this paper below is that the various aspects of social exclusion are both causes of and effects of other aspects of social exclusion. For example, low educational attainment reduces employability which causes low incomes which causes high benefit dependency which reduces motivation, creates health problems and all these have an adverse effect back on educational attainment which affects crime levels which reduces enterprise and jobs and incomes and so on. There are multiple interactions which generate a genuine circulating of causes and effects. Determined policy intervention at one point in the circle is not sufficient because its beneficial effects will be offset by adverse interventions elsewhere - a genuine comprehensive approach is required and will be the only approach which will be effective. Such an approach will only be effective if locally based

comprehensive regeneration schemes are combined with action by mainstream spending departments to provide the facilities and incentives for families to break out of the cycle of multiple deprivation.

In the next two sections of this paper we present new evidence to illustrate the points made in this discussion of social exclusion. New household survey results show the breadth and depth of multiple deprivation in local areas and logistic analysis is used to draw out the complex system of inter-relationships which exist between the many aspects and manifestations of deprivation and social exclusion which are the basis for cumulative circularity. The paper concludes with some observations on and implications for existing and new policy responses for addressing social exclusion.

The discussion so far has suggested key characteristics of the socially excluded as follows:-

- exclusion from the labour market
- low household income and benefit dependency - exclusion from consumer markets
- lack of participation and involvement in the community

The first group are excluded from the labour market and comprise the long term unemployed, those who are classified as long term sick, those who are caring more or less full time for dependent relatives and through age those who are retired. The second group are those with low household incomes who have very restricted access to consumer markets because of their poverty - frequently acquiring a high proportion of their low incomes through state benefits. Those who are excluded from labour markets are to a large extent the same groups who experience partial exclusion from consumer markets as a consequence of low incomes.

The third key feature of social exclusion is lack of participation and involvement in the community. This includes failure to exercise voting rights in local and general elections but is much more pervasive and includes many aspects of day to day living such as availability of community facilities, accessible shopping, affordable leisure facilities, fear of crime, the degree of friendliness and neighbourliness of the area, and whether the area has a

community identity and a good image as a place to live with a reasonably good quality of life.

Geographical areas with a high proportion of residents displaying all three key features of social exclusion will contain a high proportion of the UK total of social exclusion and should be the focus of comprehensive regeneration initiatives.

3 The nature of the new survey work

The social survey was undertaken in eight selected SRB Challenge Fund areas and two associated control comparator areas. A discussion of the key findings can be found in (Whitehead and Smith, 1998). These area based surveys were designed to provide data (both behavioural and attitudinal) at a level which could not be accommodated by national surveys conducted by a range of government departments. The number of areas was restricted to eight of the case study areas in order to ensure adequate sample size in each area. The areas were chosen to ensure that they illustrate the range of SRB objectives.

The case study areas where the surveys were carried out are extremely varied. Even so it was agreed that for analysis as well as logistical purposes there were strong reasons for using the same questionnaire in all areas. In other words, whatever the objective of the individual SRB and the special nature of the area, what was seen to be important were the attributes of the households in the area, their attitudes to and perceptions of that area particularly with respect to the major services provided, and their overall satisfaction with the area. Only in the case of the Merseyside Learning Partnership was it thought appropriate to target particular groups of households in the area - in this case families with children in the relevant age group.

Surveys were also carried out in two comparator areas, one relevant to the Merseyside Learning Partnership, the other an equivalent area in Brent to the Chalkhill Estate. The comparators are therefore relevant to specific SRB areas rather than to the sample as a whole. They do, however, compare with

two of the most deprived areas in the sample and therefore have particular relevance to evaluating success.

The survey sample was made up of 4,200 interviews conducted face-to-face in respondents' own homes, with fieldwork conducted between 8th November 1996 and 2 February 1997.

The case studies are Chalkhill, St Raphael's, Nottingham, Rochdale, Hangleton & Knoll, Royds Bradford, Swadlincote and Sunderland (Bidston and Gilmoos).

Key Variables

Information was collected for a number of key variables. These were:

- **Household characteristics** including structure, age, dependency, educational attainment, occupation, social class and ethnicity.
- **Satisfaction with local area as a place to live.** Key features found to be attractive, problems with area that affect quality of life, factors that would most improve physical appearance of the area. Availability of key services and perceptions of changes in overall quality of local environment in recent times.
- **Involvement in the local community** as defined as other people living within 10 to 20 minutes walk of home/estate concerned.
- **Satisfaction with housing,** length of stay in local area, reasons for moving to local area, tenure, likelihood and willingness of moving from local area during next two years.
- **Work characteristics,** length of time spent at present job, duration of time out of work, features of commuting, reasons for not being able to get a job, constraints on getting a job, participation in training schemes.
- **Perceived quality of health,** use of local health services, stress associated with particular activities and events, child-care, factors affecting truancy, time spent helping children with homework, perceived good and bad features associated with local area, quality of local area for bringing up children.
- **Features of local area in relation to safety, security and crime.** Existence and fear of crime.

- **Sports and leisure.** Availability and use of key sports and leisure facilities in local area.
- **Finance.** A number of questions relating to earnings including benefits received, perceptions of adequacy of income, meeting financial obligations, debt.
- **Perceptions of the local Single Regeneration Budget Scheme.**

4 Selected survey results on the economic and social survey conditions in the selected local areas.

4.1 *Economic characteristics of households*

The MORI survey results suggest that the main economic characteristics of households in the seven SRB case study areas are:-

- a below average proportion of heads of households are in full and part time employment
- an above average proportion are unemployed and seeking work
- an above average proportion of heads of households are economically inactive
- relatively few heads of households hold university, school or other qualifications
- a high proportion of households are dependent on various kinds of state benefits for income
- average household incomes are below the national average with relative high numbers of households receiving very low incomes and there are very few high income residents compared with GB or England as a whole

In all these characteristics there is considerable variation between the seven SRB local areas. They are all economically disadvantaged but some more than others.

4.2 *Economic activity*

Table 1 shows the labour market participation characteristics for the seven SRB case studies taken together, the most favourable and disadvantaged individual case studies and approximate national average benchmarks.

Table 1 Economic status of head of households (percentages)

	SRB areas	Nottingham SRB	Hangleton Knoll (Hove) SRB	National average benchmark ¹
In full time work	32	23	36	51
In part time work	9	6	11	5
Total in work	41	30	48	56
Registered unemployed	10	14	3	
Not registered seeking work	2	3	1	
Total unemployed	11	17	4	6
Fully retired	22	22	33	28
At home not seeking work	13	12	8	}
				}10
Student	2	9	1	}
Long term sick	11	10	6	}
Total economically inactive	48	53	48	38

Sources: MORI SRB Evaluation Household Survey and Survey of English Housing

In the seven SRB areas taken together full time working is 19 percentage points lower than in England as a whole for every 100th head of household aged over 16 years. However, part time working is 4 percentage points higher in SRB areas. Taking the two together 15 fewer heads of households are in work in SRB areas compared with the English average. Figures for Nottingham and Hangleton Knoll (Hove) case studies show the “highest” and the “lowest” of the SRB case studies.

¹ To be updated using latest survey results. Components do not always sum to totals due to rounding.

Unemployment is very high in SRB areas, about twice the English average. At 11% of adults, the unemployment percentage expressed in a more normal way (unemployed as a % of employed and unemployed) is extremely high at 19.6% for registered/claimant unemployed and 21.2% if the “not registered but seeking work” are included. Taking all SRB survey areas together one in five of the active labour force are unemployed. Table 1 shows the variation between SRB areas is very wide. In the targeted Nottingham estate, registered unemployment rates come out at 32% compared with only 6% in Hangleton Knoll. These percentages are subject to a margin of error due to small sample sizes, but even allowing for this the depth of labour market disadvantage in SRB areas is clear to see.

Although the SRB survey areas together have a low proportion of retired heads of household compared to the national benchmark, the total level of inactivity is 10% higher. Those at home not seeking work and the long term sick are relatively high in SRB areas. Hangleton Knoll (Hove) has an unusually high proportion of retired respondents in the survey but again sample sizes require care in interpretation.

4.3 *Qualifications and employability*

On the presumption that the level of qualifications in the adult population should be indicative of prospects for obtaining employment, the MORI survey reveals that 51% of heads of households in SRB survey areas had no qualifications of any kind - from school, higher education, connected with work or from government training schemes. For GB as a whole national household survey evidence suggests that about 32% hold no qualifications (to be updated).

For individual SRB areas, the population holding no qualifications varies from 60% in Rochdale to 45% in Chalkhill (London) and Hangleton Knoll (Hove).

4.4 *Levels and distribution of household incomes*

Interpretation of the MORI results on household incomes requires extra caution, not only because of relatively small sample sizes, but also because of all the normal survey difficulties encountered in the measurement of incomes such as non response and a tendency to under recording. Some respondents may also confuse gross pre tax income with post tax disposable income. Also, it is not clear in which part of the income ranges the non-respondents would largely fall. For the SRB areas as a whole non-response/non valid/don't know relating to incomes amounted to about 17% compared typically with 12% for the Survey of English Housing. For individual SRB areas non-response rates varied from 12% in Rochdale to 22% in Swadlincote Woodlands (Derbyshire) which is one of the less economically disadvantaged case study areas.

With these important qualifications very firmly in mind the MORI results are of substantial interest because they indicate broadly that income levels in SRB areas are very low and this is an important link in the cycle of economic and social deprivation.

In the SRB household survey areas taken together average incomes are almost exactly 50% of those estimated for England as a whole. The sample size, at 3480 is not small by income survey standards. Whilst there almost certainly will be an element of under recording it is fairly safe to conclude that average incomes in these SRB areas are very low compared with the English average.

Some 56% of households in SRB case study areas receive an income between £50 and £200 per week compared with about 33% for England as a whole. In England as a whole, about 39% earn incomes higher than the English average only about 13% of sample SRB households earn an income in excess of the English average. Very few high income households are to be found in areas targeted by SRB and particularly so in Nottingham, Bradford, Rochdale and Chalkhill case studies.

Table 2 Approximate income levels and distribution in SRB case study areas

	SRB survey areas	Nottingham SRB	Hangleton Knoll SRB	Approx. National benchmark ² (England average)
Average household incomes				
£ per week	197	154	259	394
£ per annum	10250	8000	13470	20480
% of households within income ranges (£s) per week				
Less than £50 per wk	9	11	5	2
50-99	26	35	21	12
100-199	30	31	26	21
200-299	15	11	16	15
300-499	14	10	19	22
500 and over	6	2	13	28
Non respondent %	(17)	(16)	(14)	(12)

Note: Income distribution for non respondents is assumed to be the same as that for respondents

Sources: MORI, SRB Evaluation Household Survey and Family Expenditure Survey (related)

4.5 Households in receipt of state benefits

Table 3 shows the proportion of households receiving individual state benefits. For SRB sample areas as a whole 28% are in receipt of income support, 56% family credit and 38% receive housing benefit. Only 17% of households receive none of these benefits. For Chalkhill in London some of the principle benefits are received by an even larger proportion of households but some of the Chalkhill figures are subject to wide margins of error due to small sample sizes.

²

National benchmark to be updated from new survey evidence when available

Table 3 Proportion of households in receipt of state benefits (Percentages)

	SRB sample areas	Chalkhill (London) SRB	Swadlincote Woodlands (Derbyshire) SRB	National benchmark ³ 1994/5
Income support	28	42	12	15 ⁴
Unemployment benefit	4	7	2	
One parent benefit	8	15	3	7
Retirement pension	23	14	28	
Incapacity benefit	11	10	11	8
Family credit	5	3	2	2
Job seekers allowance	3	2	2	
Back to work bonus	0	0	0	
Child benefit	43	49	31	30
Housing benefit	38	58	17	20
Council tax benefit	36	50	19	24
NONE OF THESE	17	15	26	

NB. Sample sizes for individual SRB areas are small and the estimates are not statistically robust

At the present time we do not have good national benchmarks figures for comparison. Much existing data is couched in terms of numbers of beneficiaries rather than households. The same survey question has been asked in the 1996 English House Condition Survey but the results are not yet available. There are strong indications from existing data that benefit receipt for the main types of benefit is significantly above the national average for the SRB sample case studies as a whole.

³ The estimates are brought together from a variety of sources which are out of date, and are very approximate. The comparative question was asked in the 1996 English Housing Condition Survey but the results are not yet available.

⁴ Income Support Statistical Enquiry - Claimants and their partners aged 16 or over as a percentage of the population aged 16 or over.

4.6 Other key features of the households in the SRB areas

The social survey allowed a number of other key features of the households concerned to be probed. Key aspects are summarised in table 4 below.

Table 4 Key features of the households in the survey areas

Household composition (all households %)				
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Swadlincote</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Lone parent	26	5	13	6
Tenure and dwelling attributes (%)				
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Swadlincote</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Owner occupied	6	69	47	68
Satisfaction with area and housing (all respondents %)				
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Sunderland</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Very/fairly satisfied; Dwelling	53	91	80	90
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Hang. Knoll</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Very/fairly satisfied; Area	45	85	69	87
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Sunderland</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Very/dissatisfied; Dwelling	23	1	9	3
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Hang Knoll/ Swadlincote</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Very/dissatisfied; Area	28	5	13	5?
Serious problems which affect the quality of life by area (%)				
	<i>Nottingham</i>	<i>Hang. Knoll</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Crime	53	16	36	22
	<i>Bradford</i>	<i>Hang. Knoll</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Drugs	59	8	23	3
Respondents view on the area as a place for bringing up children (%)				
	<i>Nottingham</i>	<i>Hang. Knoll</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Good	25	74	52	81
	<i>Nottingham</i>	<i>Swadlincote</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Bad	50	6	28	14

Table 4 Key features of the households in the survey areas contd.

Help with homework (hours per week, % responsible adults)				
	<i>Swadlincote</i>	<i>Rochdale</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
No	10	18	14	7
	<i>Rochdale</i>	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
5+ hours	11	38	20	39
Health (all household members %)				
	<i>Nottingham</i>	<i>Swadlincote</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
Good	56	61	58	
	<i>Rochdale</i>	<i>Hang. Knoll</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
Not good	26	21	23	
Attitude to leisure facilities by area (respondents %)				
	<i>Bradford</i>	<i>Swadlincote</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
Very dissatisfied	42	5	28	
Safety, security and crime (%)				
	<i>Bradford</i>	<i>Swadlincote</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
Area very/fairly unsafe	32	49	40	
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Rochdale</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Area very unsafe/don't go out after dark	50	30	42	11*
Reasons				
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Hang. Knoll</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
Fear of attack	82	52	67	
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Swadlincote</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
Youths	26	45	35	
	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Hang. Knoll</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
Lighting	28	11	18	
	<i>Sunderland</i>	<i>Bradford</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
Drugs dealers	3	28	11	
Experienced problems				
	<i>Hang. Knoll</i>	<i>Bradford</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Break-in	7	27	15	8**
	<i>Hang. Knoll</i>	<i>Rochdale</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Car stolen	4	13	8	2

* very unsafe only

**burglary

Table 4 Key features of the households in the survey areas contd.

Cars available for use by the household (respondents %)				
	<i>Nottingham</i>	<i>Swadlincote</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
No car	59	28	44	31
Mobility: Headline figures (%)				
<i>Time in dwelling</i>	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Nottingham</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
< 1 year	3	21	11	11
> 3 years	14	37	24	
<i>Time in area</i>	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>Nottingham</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
< 1 year	2	21	11	
> 3 years	8	25	8	
<i>Want to move</i>				
	<i>Sunderland</i>	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
From dwelling	18	62	35	
	<i>Sunderland</i>	<i>Nottingham</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	
From area	39	73	61	
<i>Likely to move</i>				
	<i>Sunderland</i>	<i>Chalkhill</i>	<i>7 SRB</i>	<i>England</i>
Very/fairly likely	12	46	23	17
Very/fairly unlikely	85	40	72	82

In interpreting the evidence in table 4 we are concerned to draw-out the key features that may lead to and reinforce social exclusion relating to both the individual and the area that they live-in.

Section 4.1 indicated how residents in many of the regeneration areas are disadvantaged economically in terms of their share of local labour market jobs, income, training opportunities and access to education. In line with our understanding of the underlying forces behind social exclusion and its perpetuation these economic factors need to be considered alongside the social and physical characteristics of the local areas in which individuals live. Moreover, in assessing the scale of the effects observed it is essential to emphasise the relative as well as the absolute, that is, for example, how much **greater** than the national average is the incidence of crime, the amount of physical dereliction etc., that we observe in the area concerned.

To reiterate, we can only understand the powerful forces behind social exclusion and the effect it has on denying the individual and their family access to the opportunities in life if we consider the inter-relationships which exist between the economic, social and physical and how this leads to the perpetuation of the problem through time.

It is a noticeable aspect of the households in the SRB areas that the proportion of lone parent households is over twice the English average. In the most extreme case, namely Chalkhill in London, one in four of the households is a lone parent.

Taking all of the survey areas together reveals that housing tenure is heavily skewed away from owner occupation in relation to the English average. Chalkhill again represents the extreme case with only 6% of the households owner occupiers.

Satisfaction with the housing stock is some 10% below that of the English average in the seven SRB areas taken together and Chalkhill is again an extreme case with only every second person being very or fairly satisfied and nearly one in four very dissatisfied.

Residents are also not as satisfied with the quality of their area as in the English average. Only 5% of respondents in the all England survey were not very/fairly dissatisfied with their area compared with 13% in the seven SRB areas overall. Chalkhill is again the extreme case where some 28% of households are not very/fairly satisfied.

Perceptions of residents about serious problems in the area affecting their quality of life are also very worrying. Thus, 36% of the residents in the seven SRB areas taken as a whole perceive a serious problem with crime compared with 22% in the English comparator. In the Nottingham SRB area nearly one in two felt that there was a serious problem with crime. The picture obviously varies considerably by area with some evidence for regional influences. Residents in the southern area of Hangleton Knoll for example are 6% less likely than the English average to perceive a serious problem with crime.

Perceptions of drug abuse are very serious. The average for the all seven SRB average is 23% of households compared with the English average of 3%. In the best SRB area in this respect the average is 8% (Hangleton Knoll), however in the worse (Bradford) it is 59%.

The degree to which problems are likely to affect children and thus add an inter-generational dimension to the problems faced is reflected in the views of respondents as to the quality of their area as a place in which to bring-up children. There are significant variations between areas with the worse position recorded in Nottingham where one in two identify with a 'bad' response, whilst in Swadlincote it is only 6%.

It is also rather disappointing that in relation to the educational well-being of children that responsible household heads in the seven SRB areas taken together twice as many are unlikely to help their children with their homework than the English average. In the worst area, Rochdale, 18% indicated that they offered no such support to their children.

Whilst there is no good English comparator it is noticeable that 23% of all household members in the survey and 26% in the worst case (Rochdale) identified with relatively poor health.

Following on from the evidence on health 28% of all SRB residents were dissatisfied with the leisure facilities in their area. The most extreme case was Bradford at 42%.

Fear of crime, and general perceptions about safety were alarmingly worse in the all seven SRB areas than an English average where useful comparison could be made. (Figures for the English average are for the very unsafe question only). Some 42% identified their area as a very unsafe one or they did not feel able to go out at night-in Chalkhill one in two households felt this! Fear of attack was regarded as the principal reason for the perception as to safety. Some 67% of households feared being attacked and in Chalkhill the proportion was a staggering 82%!

The behaviour of young people was felt to be a reason for a lack of safety in 35% of the households in the seven SRB areas taken together. Drug dealers were identified as part of the reason for feeling unsafe in 11% of all SRB areas, although the figure was as high as 28% in Bradford.

In so far as statistics allow, households in SRB areas have experienced a break-in about twice that of the English average, although the English information relates to burglary only. However, some 27% of all households in Bradford had experienced a break-in. There are extreme regional variations. In Hangleton Knoll the local area is much on a par with the English average. Having a car stolen has been a problem for 8% of all SRB households compared with an England average of only 2%. The worst area was Rochdale with 13% having had their car stolen.

The final area of enquiry related to the overall mobility of the households and the length of time they had lived in their area, together with their desire to move. Some 44% of households in SRB areas had no car. This compares with 31% in England. The worst local area in this respect in the sample was Nottingham with 59% not having a car.

The length of time which respondents had spent in their local area was difficult to compare with national statistics. Overall, about the same percentage of all SRB households had been in their dwelling for less than one year when compared with the English average. Comparator figures were not available for the greater than three year position. Time spent in the area or house did vary substantially by area. In Nottingham the proportion having been in the area for one year or less was as high as 21%.

Whilst there are no comparator figures, the proportion of residents in all SRB areas who wanted to move from their dwelling and area was very high. Some 35% of all respondents wanted to leave their dwelling and 61% their local areas. In Chalkhill the percentage wanting to leave their dwelling was 62%. In Nottingham the proportion wanting to leave their local areas was 73%. These results must reflect a very high level of unhappiness on the part of residents with their local environment.

The likelihood of a move actually occurring was higher in the SRB areas taken together than in England. This result was heavily influenced by the nature of the regeneration scheme taking place in the area concerned. In Chalkhill, for example, residents are being relocated using SRB funds.

4.7 **Links between economic, social and housing characteristics of households**

Table 5 Bringing the evidence together; the breadth and depth of social exclusion

	Worst SRB estates	Average SRB areas	National average
<i>Head of household</i>			
Working full or part time	43	54	80
Unemployed seeking work	25	16	9
At home not seeking work	17	16	6
Long term sick	15	14	6
% income below £100	40	37	22
% on Income Support, Unemployment Benefit, Incapacity Benefit	61	46	28
% on Income Support only	40	26	15
% on Housing Benefit	50	34	20
% of lone parents	27	13	6
% social housing	94	53	32
Dissatisfied with area	28	13	5
Area very unsafe after dark	50	42	11
Likely to move	46	23	17
Do not feel closely involved with the community	80	72	?

Source: Social Survey

We can now draw together the findings from the social survey together to demonstrate clearly that the socially excluded in England experience severe deprivation in breadth and depth and that all aspects of their life are affected. Table 5 brings together the social survey results for the worst SRB estates examined, the average for the SRB areas in the survey and wherever possible national average for the full range of socio-economic indicators.

The results are fairly unequivocal. In the worst estates in England only 43% of the head of households is working, compared with a national average of 80%. The average drawn from our social survey of SRB areas is close to the worst estate average. Some 25% of the head of households on the worst estates were unemployed compared with a national average of 9%. The SRB average was in between at 16%. Those who were at home inactive not seeking work were 17% in the worst estates. The SRB average was close to this and both compare with a national average of only 6%.

Ill health is a dominant feature of a sizeable proportion of the head of households in the worst estates and the average needy SRB areas at 15% and 14% respectively. This compares with the national average of only 6%.

The chronic relative poverty in income terms is reflected in the fact that 40% of those households on the worst estates have an average of less than £100. This compares with a national average of only 20% with an income as low as this. The SRB needy area average is close to that of the worst estates. The percentage of households on some form of income support at 61% of households on the worst estates compares vividly with the national average of 28%. The SRB needy area average is between the two. The percentage on Income Support only and Housing Benefit only illustrate the scale of income dependency.

The proportion of households who are lone parents is 27% on the worst estates, 13% on the needy SRB and 6% nationally. Virtually all the households on the worst estates are in social housing, about half on the needy SRB areas and only one in three nationally.

Those households dissatisfied with their local area in the worst estates was 28% compared with a national average of 5%. The SRB needy areas stood at 13%. One in two of those on the worst estates felt very unsafe after dark compared to 11% nationally. The SRB needy areas were not far from the worst estates at 42%. Overall 46% of those households on the worst estates wanted to move compared to 17% nationally and 23% in the needy SRB areas.

The breakdown of any integration with the local community on the part of these living on the worst estates is manifestly clear. Overall 80% on the worst estates do not feel closely involved with their community. The statistic for the needy SRB areas is pretty similar and whilst we do not know the national figure we can be pretty sure it would be a lot lower than the result for the worst estates and needy SRB areas.

Whilst relatively high numbers of households in the surveyed areas wanted to move out of their area in order to improve their chances of gaining better access to quality of life, better housing and environment and job opportunities, relatively few felt that they would ever be able to do so. As such their relative isolation was the result of both their own personal characteristics (like lack of education), the characteristics of their dwellings and the areas in which they lived (arising from poor quality housing, housing tenure etc). All the signs were that their relative isolation was likely to continue for both them and their children.

5 Drawing out the inter-relationships; the use of logistic analysis

In order to identify the powerful inter-relations which exist between variables it is helpful to analyse the data using logistic analysis. The analysis permits a more quantitative and systematic appreciation of the body of the data as a whole and allows key interfaces to be revealed and in particular an analysis of inter-generational effects. The logistics analysis allowed an in-depth assessment of the characteristics of those residents who were unemployed, on low incomes and not in-touch with the local community. It is also possible to analyse whether particular types of residents were more or less dissatisfied with the area concerned and thus more likely to be experiencing some form of exclusion.

5.1 *Variables in the database*

The database used for the regressions contained a number of variables for use as explanatory factors. These were as follows:

FRIENDS	Whether respondent could call on friends or relatives in the area for help or not
COMMUNIT	Whether respondent feels closely involved in the local community or not
RENTED	Whether respondent is in rented accommodation or not
MARRIED	Whether respondent is married or not
MALE	Whether respondent is male or female
AGE45	Whether respondent is aged under 45 years or over
HEALTH	Whether head of household has been in poor health over the last 12 months or not
CHILDREN	Whether respondent is the responsible adult for any children aged 16 or under living in the household or not
SAFETY	Whether respondent feels safe walking alone in or around the area of their home after dark or not
SPORTS	Whether overall the respondent is satisfied with the sports and leisure facilities in the area or not
COPING£	Whether respondent feels able to cope on total household income or not
LONEPAR	Whether respondent is in a lone parent family household or not
CAROWNER	Whether household has use of car/van or not
WISHMOVE	Whether respondent is likely to move out of area in the next 2 years or not
YYINAREA	Whether respondent/spouse/partner have lived in the area for under 7 years or more
UNEMP	Whether respondent is unemployed (registered/unregistered) or not
NOQUALS	Whether respondent has no qualifications or some
INCSUPP	Whether respondent is in receipt of income support or not
NONWHITE	Whether head of household is non-white or white.
UORSICK	Whether respondent is unemployed (registered/unregistered)/sick or neither
DISSATIS	Whether respondent feels dissatisfied with the area or not

5.2 *Description of the model*

Logistic regression analysis is particularly helpful in situations in the social sciences where it is desired to identify the characteristics associated with a particular outcome or tendency. Thus, it is helpful in the case of the present study because it allows the probability of a respondent to a particular question having a specific characteristic. Thus, in the social survey we are able to identify what were the characteristics of those residents who stated that they most wanted to leave the area. The logistics technique allows us to assign odds to a resident making a positive response having a specific characteristic (i.e. being single or married, single parent etc.).

The technique is similar in many ways to a linear regression model but it is more tailor made to be used in circumstances where the dependent variable is dichotomous.

Section 2 defined those circumstances facing an individual which were likely to lead them, and their family, to be prevented from enjoying the life chances and quality of life experienced by the majority of society. As such, our objective was to provide a workable definition of what constituted social exclusion. Our view was that there were four key factors that were of central importance. These were; unemployment, low income, isolation from the community and exposure to a poor/low quality housing/local environment. Clearly these factors are strongly inter-related. Thus, those who are unemployed are usually on relatively low incomes. They may, as a result of this, live in low quality housing in areas where there is large scale dereliction and poor facilities. Isolation is reinforced by the collapse of traditional social networks and community ties. A continued failure to gain work further constrains the amount of social interaction which can take place.

Section (4) assessed the broad characteristics of the residents in the areas that were surveyed. Whilst there was considerable variation it was clear that a relatively high proportion of the residents and thus households had at least one of the characteristics that are important features in the processes which lead to social exclusion. However, the analysis was constrained by the strong interrelationships which exist between characteristics. Ideally we wished to assess what were the characteristics of those who had at least one of the key features associated with social exclusion, controlling where possible for the interrelationships which exist. To this end we undertook logistics analysis. The approach was in two parts.

5.3 *The findings*

Using the logistics analysis we assessed the characteristics which increase the possibility of an individual experiencing each of the conditions we believe contribute to social exclusion. Our objective was thus to assess whether the people who were socially excluded according to our different criteria had common characteristics which thus might have been responsible for or influenced their probability of being socially excluded.

We had defined the socially excluded to be those experiencing exclusion from the labour market, having low household income and benefit dependency (and thus excluded from consumer markets) and those

households who have a lack of participation and investment in the community.

Table 6 presents the results of the logistic regressions for all three groups of the socially excluded. A statistically significant variable indicates that the client group concerned has a higher probability than average of having that characteristic. Common to the “those on Income Support” and “unemployed” groups is the higher probability of them having rented housing tenure (rented and in the main social housing), their relative ill-health, and their ethnicity.

The significant difference between those on support and the unemployed is that the unemployed tend not to be married, to be younger (below 45 years of age) and **not** to be coping on their incomes. The lack of qualification characteristic appeared only to be important for those unemployed. The unemployed tended to be receiving Income Support and be male. Those receiving Income Support tended to be responsible for children under 16, a lone parent, to be unemployed and felt able to cope on their total household income.

We next examined for each of the categories of socially excluded who were dissatisfied with their area whether the respondents had a higher probability of having certain common characteristics. The results, presented in table 7, are most revealing. Common to all three groups was their feelings of lack of safety, their lack of integration with the community, their general dissatisfaction with the sports/leisure facilities and one suspects other facilities in the area and their wish to move out of the area concerned during the next two years. Two of the three groups shared a lack of involvement with the community, an inability to call on friends or relatives in the area, the tendency to have lived in the area for over two years, responsibilities for children under 16 years of age and being male.

A further area of enquiry was to assess the characteristics of those who were so dissatisfied with the area that they wished to leave. We examined the characteristics of all households responding in this way and also for two categories of the socially excluded, namely those on low incomes and unemployed. The results are presented in table 8. In general, those households who wished to leave their local area had a higher probability of

having little involvement in the community or feeling able to call on friends or relatives in the area, they lived in rented predominately social housing, were not married, usually male, relatively young (under 45 years of age), responsible for children under 16, did not feel safe in the area after dark, had lived in the area for less than seven years, were non white and did not have qualifications. Both socially excluded groups shared the common characteristic of living in social housing and feeling unsafe walking alone in the area after dark.

Finally we concluded our analysis by considering what were the characteristics of the households who did feel closely involved with the community, both for all households and two groups of the socially excluded. The results presented in table 9 are of great interest. They show that in general households that feel closely involved with the community have a higher probability of feeling that they could call on friends or relatives in the local area, are married, aged 45 years or over, tend to have had poor ill health over the last twelve months, were responsible for children under 16, felt safe walking alone in the area after dark, did not wish to move out of the area in the next two years, had lived in the area for over seven years and were not white. They were quite satisfied with their local area and its sports/leisure facilities. Those closely involved with the community who had low incomes or were unemployed shared the characteristics of having lived in the area for over seven years, feeling satisfied with the area, had friends and being satisfied with the sports and leisure facilities in the area. Those closely involved in the community who were on Income Support tended not to be coping on their household income, but did have qualifications. Those closely involved with the community who were unemployed had a greater probability of being non white.

Table 6 Logistic Regression (independent variables significant at 5%):

Dependent Variable	RENTED	MARRIED	AGE 45	HEALTH	CHILDREN	COPING £	LONE PARENT	CAR OWNER	NO QUALIFICATIONS	NON WHITE	UOR SICK	MALE	INC SUPP	FRI ENDS	SAFETY	SPORTS	WISH MOVE	DIS Satisf	YYIN AREA
Receiving Income Support ¹ :-	1.2143	.4413	-.3433	.2956	.5091	.4695	1.8943	.8297	.4993	.2282	1.5446								
Unemployed ² -	.7179	-.2498	.9654	.3582		-1.1479				.2368		1.0714	1.3118						
Not Closely involved with the community ³		-.2115	.3881	-.1737	-.3023					-.4941				-.9692	-.3208	-.4593	.2484	.5609	.3961

RENTED: In rented accommodation

MARRIED: Married

AGE45: Under 45 years old

HEALTH: In poor health over last 12 months

CHILDREN: Respondent is responsible for children under 16

COPING£: Respondent feels able to cope on total household income

LONEPAR: Respondent is in a lone parent family household

CAROWNER: Respondent has use of/owns a car/van

NOQUALS: Respondent has no qualifications

NON WHITE: Non white

UORSICK: Respondent is unemployed/sick

MALE: Male

INCSUPP: Respondent is in receipt of Income Support

FRIENDS: Respondent could call on friends or relatives in the area

SAFETY: Respondent feels safe walking alone in or around the area after dark

SPORTS: Overall the respondent is satisfied with sports/leisure facilities in the area

WISHMOVE: Respondent is likely to move out of the area in the next 2 years

DISSATIS: Respondent feels dissatisfied with the area

YYINAREA: Respondent/spouse/partner have lived in the area for under 7 years

¹ The UNEMP variable was excluded from the regression given its obvious correlation with the UORSICK variable

² The UORSICK variable was excluded from the regression given its obvious correlation with the UNEMP variable

³ The UORSICK variable was excluded from the regression. Equation had a relatively poor fit, where the explanatory power was quite low.

Table 7 Logistic regression (independent variables significant at 5%)

Dependent Variable	FRIENDS	COMMUNIT	RENTED	MALE	HEALTH	CHILDREN	SAFETY	SPORTS	COPING£	WISH MOVE	YYINAREA
Dissatisfied with area (those socially excluded through no jobs) ¹		-.7479		.5393			-.8111	-.9433		.9192	
Dissatisfied with area (those socially excluded through low income) ²	-.5274	-.7261		.4337	.449	.5673	-.5678	-.6729		1.1027	-.3724
Dissatisfied with the area (those socially excluded through lack of involvement in community) ³	-.6302		.2427			.3705	-.6905	-.6305	-.2595	1.1938	-.2886

FRIENDS: Respondent could call on friends or relatives in the area

COMMUNIT: Respondent feels closely involved in the community

RENTED: In rented accommodation

MALE: Male

HEALTH: In poor health over last 12 months

CHILDREN: Respondent is responsible for children under 16

SAFETY: Respondent feels safe walking alone in or around the area after dark

SPORTS: Overall the respondent is satisfied with sports/leisure facilities in the area

COPING£: Respondent feels able to cope on total household income

WISHMOVE: Respondent is likely to move out of the area in the next 2 years

YYINAREA: Respondent/spouse/partner have lived in the area for under 7 years

¹ The UNEMP and UORSICK variables were excluded from this regression.

² The UNEMP and INCSUPP variables were excluded from this regression.

³ The UNEMP and COMMUNIT variables were excluded from this regression.

Table 8 Logistic Regression (independent variables isgnificant at 5%)

Dependent Variable	FRIENDS	COMM UNIT	RENTED	MARR IED	MALE	AGE45	CHILD REN	SAFETY	YYIN AREA	NON WHITE	NO QUALS	UORSICK
Likely to move out of area in the next 2 years (all heads of households) ¹	-.3867	-.3672	.4515	-.2499	.3113	.7402	.2622	-.4405	.5195	.505	-.4952	
Likely to move out of the area in next 2 years (base those unemployed or sick) ²			.6496					-.5688	.5949			
Likely to move out of the area in next 2 years (those socially excluded through low income) ³		-.5306	.9519			.6357	.8179	-.6873				.3388

FRIENDS: Respondent could call on friends or relatives in the area

COMMUNIT: Respondent feels closely involved in the community

RENTED: In rented accommodation

MARRIED: Married

MALE: Male

AGE45: Under 45 years old

CHILDREN: Respondent is responsible for children under 16

SAFETY: Respondent feels safe walking alone in or around the area after dark

YYINAREA: Respondent/spouse/partner have lived in the area for under 7 years

NONWHITE: Non white

NOQUALS: Respondent has no qualifications

UORSICK: Respondent is unemployed/sick

¹ The UNEMP and DISSATIS variables were excluded from this regression.

² The UNEMP, DISSATIS and UORSICK variables were excluded from this regression.

³ The UNEMP, DISSATIS and INCSUPP variables were excluded from this regression

Table 9 Logistic Regression (independent variables significant at 5%)

Dependent Variable	FRIENDS	MARRIED	AGE45	HEALTH	CHILDREN	SAFETY	SPORTS	COPING£	WISH MOVE	YYIN AREA	NON WHITE	NO QUALS	DISSATIS
Closely involved with the community (all heads of households) ¹	.9692	.2115	-.3881	.1737	.3023	.3208	.4593		-.2484	-.3961	.4941		-.5609
Closely involved with the community (base those unemployed or sick) ²	1.3463						.7273			-.6095	.633		-.7326
Closely involved with the community (base those on Income Support) ³	1.0434					.371	.4782	-.348		-.8284		-.3665	-.7321

FRIENDS: Respondent could call on friends or relatives in the area

MARRIED: Married

AGE45: Under 45 years old

HEALTH: In poor health over last 12 months

CHILDREN: Respondent is responsible for children under 16

SAFETY: Respondent feels safe walking alone in or around the area after dark

SPORTS: Overall the respondent is satisfied with sports/leisure facilities in the area

COPING£: Respondent feels able to cope on total household income

WISHMOVE: Respondent is likely to move out of the area in the next 2 years

YYINAREA: Respondent/spouse/partner have lived in the area for under 7 years

NONWHITE: Non white

NOQUALS: Respondent has no qualifications

DISSATIS: Respondent feels dissatisfied with the area

¹ The UORSICK variable was excluded from this regression.

² The UNEMP and UORSICK variables were excluded from this regression.

³The UNEMP and INCSUPP variables were excluded from this regression.

Overall these findings demonstrate that social exclusion in a variety of forms is affecting those in our society who are likely to be the most vulnerable. Exclusion operates along a number of dimensions embracing the social, economic and physical. The ability of those who are excluded from the quality of life that so many people in the UK take for granted is heavily constrained by the hard economic realities of not having a job, corresponding paucity of income, their housing tenure (which together with income influences their ability to move), and their physical well being. Ill health and, in some cases, lack of qualifications also appear to be important. More subtle influences arising from race and gender may also play a part. Those who experience social exclusion through being unemployed tend to have a higher probability of being male, single, in poor health, in rented accommodation and ethnic. Those who are excluded appear to be least able to turn to others in their immediate locality/community for help or at the very least some comfort. A poor quality physical environment associated with dwelling and place compounds the problems experienced. In the next section we assess whether future policy might go to offer some salvation to those affected drawing on these survey results.

6 Policy considerations

At least three decades of active urban policy in different parts of the UK provide a clear message that concentrated deprivation and social exclusion is a stubborn problem which is not going to be resolved quickly or easily. Throughout successive policy initiatives, expectations and aspirations have tended to exceed the actuality of what can be achieved on the ground. Even so some important lessons can be learned from the experience of previous policy initiatives and emerging policy dilemmas are being resolved - and these will be useful in determining the shape of future policy.

In our paper we have identified key factors that are important in bringing about social exclusion. Sustained unemployment means that a person does not experience the many advantages which having a secure job confers, not least of which is having a stable source of income. Lack of income, or very low levels of income, further reinforce social exclusion since it restricts the

ability to consume the goods and services, including housing, which are essential ingredients in a reasonable standard of living. Isolation from community or family networks is another route by which social exclusion is perpetuated. All of the above effects are compounded when the individual is exposed to low quality housing and a poor physical environment. The evidence indicates quite clearly that social exclusion along these dimensions is disproportionately concentrated to an alarming extent in certain areas across England.

A further factor that should be considered is that there are grounds to believe that changes which have, and are, occurring to British society and its economy have reduced the power of dampening mechanisms that perhaps traditionally tended to attenuate the degree and extent of social exclusion.

Thus, the evidence is that those who are **less** likely to feel socially excluded have stronger ties with their community and family than those who are amongst the excluded, at least as we have tried to identify them. The fragmentation of traditional community and family networks in society thus has not helped.

On the economic front the pace of economic change and competition experienced by companies has accelerated, often provoking the need for significant rationalisation and closure of companies which have been dominant employers in a local area for many decades. New production processes have reduced the need for the unskilled and semi-skilled worker and as a consequence this has consigned large numbers of people to the ranks of the long-term unemployed, the number of whom have risen virtually every decade in post war Britain.

Other changes in society have been associated with increased mobility of those workers who have skills, relatively high incomes, private wealth usually in the form of a house, and the ability to commute fairly long distances from home to work which comes from owning a car. As a consequence, the upwardly mobile have forsaken the grime and congestion of the inner cities and other declining areas. As this relatively well off group have moved they have reduced the level of spending power in shops and investment in local housing in the areas from which they have departed. For many years in the

postwar period New Town and overspill planning policies helped to reinforce these trends.

In the light of all of this the need for new initiatives to tackle geographical concentrations of social exclusion has probably never been greater. We conclude this paper by making suggestions where existing policy initiatives might usefully be extended and perhaps some innovative new approaches tried. We consider five key issues;

1. Changes which might usefully occur to the scale and coverage of area targeted regeneration programmes which currently absorb a relatively small proportion of government expenditure
2. The role of **Partnership** based delivery mechanisms relative to **agency** based approaches
3. How to draw community based organisations more into the process of regeneration at the local level
4. Involving the private sector to a greater degree at the local level
5. The scope for achieving a more co-ordinated and integrated policy response both to help prevent new social exclusion emerging as well as removing that which currently exists. This includes the need to reconcile and co-ordinate achievements arising from **area targeted regeneration** programmes with those produced by the activities of mainstream government departments which are often **more people orientated**.

6.1 *The scale and coverage of area targeted regeneration programmes*

How large should these regeneration programmes be in order to achieve an appropriate balance between prevention and cure? In recent years expenditure on area targeted comprehensive regeneration programmes has been of the order of £1500 million per annum in the UK. This is equivalent to about $\frac{1}{2}\%$ of total public expenditure and only about $\frac{1}{4}\%$ of expenditure on social security benefits. This is indicative of a fairly low priority attached

to a genuine cure of existing concentrations of deprivation and social exclusion as opposed to providing financial compensation for the symptoms. The cautious approach to allocating resources for area targeted comprehensive regeneration programmes may have something to do with doubts about how effective and cost effective they can be. The evidence is not yet conclusive.

Most policy initiatives have been found to have some (beneficial) effects but the evidence suggests that, like the proverbial ocean liner, it takes a long time and a lot of energy and expense to “turn round” a local area with deep seated problems of deprivation and social exclusion. A strong adverse momentum has to be slowed down and halted before a positive and sustained momentum is generated. This can require 10 to 20 years of sustained action in some of the worse cases. As an example, the regeneration of London Docklands alone which is taking place over a period of 20 or more years will have involved public expenditure of the order of £4,000 million (Rhodes and Tyler, 1998).

Although the results of the expenditure are evident in many areas there is clearly a limit to how many deprived areas can be regenerated at any one time. And because of the equity problems associated with giving total priority to a few areas at a time funding tends to be spread more widely across all or most deprived areas but at a level which is not high enough to bring areas up to the threshold required to sustain a regeneration momentum before funding is withdrawn. Current SRB schemes for example spreads funding widely across deprived areas for a period of between 3 and 7 years, although they may be renewable.

Recent research (Brennan, Rhodes and Tyler 1998) has indicated that in allocating funds for local area regeneration whilst it is important to concentrate significant levels of resources on the areas of greatest need it is vital that funds can also be made available to areas where problems of emerging need are becoming evident, as in the Coalfield Areas. It is only in this way that emerging problems of social exclusion may be tackled before they have often become quite deep rooted and entrenched. In this context there are advantages in avoiding a fixed designated boundary approach to local area regeneration policy but rather allow the boundary-less approach which has characterised the workings of SRB to date.

6.2 *What is Partnership based delivery re agency approach*

Recent policy has moved strongly in favour of delivering comprehensive regeneration programmes through regional and local Partnerships and evidence is emerging that this brings with it some distinct advantages. There are also associated weaknesses/dangers with the partnership approach which are less prevalent in single focus agency approaches to policy delivery.

The main differences in practice between the two type of delivery mechanisms are not that large. The main differences are the formality of the structural arrangements, the funding arrangements and the staffing. The single focus agency has a more formal structure with a Board and hierarchy of staff although the Board often contains directors nominated from central government, local authorities and other local interest and the private sector. This was the case with Urban Department Corporations and is likely to be the case with the proposed Regional Development Agencies. This is a formal type of Central Government, local Government, private sector partnership and one weakness perceived in such an arrangement is that the community groups/voluntary sector do not feel adequately represented by local authority nominated Directors and seek representation in their own right. Another weakness is that single focus agencies do not have the breadth of inter-departmental powers and knowledge to carry out comprehensive economic, social and physical regeneration - they are responsible to a single department rather than a group of departments who all carry out functions and policies needed for regeneration of areas experiencing widespread economic social exclusion. Nevertheless the single focus nature of agencies means that relationships with their sponsoring department are clear, funding is more secure, staff with the necessary skills can be recruited, and arrangements for maintaining public accountability are tried and tested.

Partnerships tend to be structurally looser bodies often containing a lead partner and partners from relevant Departments, local authority departments, TECs/LECs, community groups and the private sector. In practice Partnerships are public sector led. The Directors and managers of Partnerships are individual administrative officers from these organisations who have other full time jobs and do not always have the authority to take action affecting their employer organisation. In practice the Partnership itself

only has a handful of administrative staff, often only one, with the bulk of work taken on by the staff of the partner organisations. Partnerships have needed to be closely policed for public accountability by the Government Offices for the Regions. Their potential strength is that Partnerships bring together existing local organisations to carry out locally designed regeneration schemes.

However, there are dangers in the Partnership approach. The experience so far has been for Partnerships to grow and multiply with all partners also being represented in each other Partnerships. Excessive fragmentation can generate tokens with frequent lengthy meetings being an end in itself with ephemeral regeneration projects on the ground not well implemented because management resources are scarce and stretched and not making any lasting impact on social exclusion. Relationships are blurred, commitment to real Partnership is measured, management resources are stretched, funding is uncertain and the regeneration results can be patchy. The targeting problems of operating in Partnership have been significant and much improvement remains to be secured although many examples of good practice have also emerged.

Even where partnership works well and genuinely involves the community there are severe constraints on how far regeneration policy initiatives can achieve regeneration from within deprived areas. So long as educational attainments remain low in socially excluded communities and socially excluded families are moved into the older housing stock of disadvantaged areas, policy initiatives have prevented further deterioration but have generally not achieved a full turnaround to self sustaining communities with low levels of social exclusion. Some regeneration initiatives are doing good work in tackling the third element of social exclusion, namely encouraging community participation and involvement but widespread improvements to labour market and consumer exclusion have generally not been secured - even with initiatives of a duration of five to ten years.

6.3 *Drawing in the community*

The involvement of the community and voluntary sector in area based regeneration initiatives like SRB is being constrained by the lack of capacity

of the sector to become more fully involved in the regeneration process. The results from the logistic analysis presented in section 5 pointed tentatively to the role of this sector in helping to attenuate social exclusion in so far as those who were in the relatively non-socially excluded groups were actively linked to their local community whilst those in the socially excluded groups were not.

There are a number of ways by which community involvement in local area regeneration and thus the process of reducing social exclusion might be enhanced. We have referred to these extensively in a forthcoming report (Brennan, Rhodes and Tyler, 1998). One way which could be helpful is to ensure that local partnerships in areas receiving SRB support are encouraged to have at least one project managed by a community/voluntary group and that such projects include a cost component specifically for the purpose of raising the management/administrative capacity of the group.

6.4 *Involving the private sector*

Although much has been achieved there remain considerable problems in involving the private sector in the regeneration process in local areas on an ongoing basis. In terms of leading local area regeneration packages the presence of the private sector is rare. Thus, out of 373 regeneration partnerships under rounds one and two of the SRB only 6% were actually **led** by the private sector. Recent research undertaken by the authors have identified the principal routes by which involvement has been occurring under SRB. These are:

- as lead partner
- as one of several non-lead partners
- as a non-partner financial contributor (or contributor in kind)
- as a developer of property
- as a supplier of goods and/or services to the partnerships (or as a sub-contractor delivering part of the programme).
- as a beneficiary of the programme, particularly in business support schemes.

Of these, the highest level of private sector commitment arises from private sector involvement through property-led regeneration. Much of this involvement is inevitably front-ended in the process of regenerating a local

area and in such circumstances the private sector contribution frequently drops away once the physical side of things is complete. Ongoing involvement in nurturing and reinforcing the regeneration momentum is much less frequent.

In considering how to involve the private sector more in the process of regeneration it is helpful to make the distinction between the attraction of new private sector investment from outside an area (often in the form of a new company opening) and the encouragement of private sector assistance from companies already within an area (the indigenous sector). It is often not easy to make such a rigid distinction but it is a helpful starting point from which to consider a number of issues relating to the involvement of the private sector in the regeneration process.

Clearly, in seeking to encourage local area regeneration it is important to attract new investment from outside whether it be a new factory or a developer interested in a new shopping centre. In the context of the evaluation of present spatial policy the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) have a clear role to play in setting and maintaining a strategic **regional** context within which such policy can be framed. The use of traditional land and property related measures embracing the work of English Partnerships will remain valuable levers with which to encourage and steer the location of investment. Some sort of strategic approach is essential in order to avoid often quite costly competitive displacement of such investment within broad regions which has been a feature of the policy scene throughout the 1980s. (There remains the problem of avoiding such competitive displacement between regions but that's another story!).

However, whilst attracting private sector involvement from without is clearly important the relatively weak feature of much British local area regeneration to date has been the inability to involve companies and investors currently **in** or **around** the area concerned in the regeneration processes and in such a way that there is some **durability** to the commitment. What is needed is more ongoing partnership between the public and private sector in securing and maintaining the economic and social vitality of the area concerned. The relative failure to achieve more in this direction is a rather depressing feature of Britain's post-war regeneration initiatives and would seem to be in the

interest of all parties concerned. (A relatively rare example of the economists concept of Pareto Optimality!).

In seeking to consider how private sector players might be more fully involved in both regenerating and maintaining the viability of local areas there are some important points to consider. One is that local area regeneration partnership will, with a few notable exceptions, have to sell the concept of participation to the private sector and in a language that it can understand. This requires identifying, and articulating clearly, just what private sector players have to gain from encouraging and maintaining the economic and indeed social vitality of a local area. Perhaps somewhat surprisingly this is very rarely done in a comprehensive and compelling manner.

Besides ensuring that a good 'business' case is made to companies as to why they should participate in the ongoing regeneration of their local area there may be scope to use the local business rate as a vehicle to pump-prime involvement.

Some local private sector players have perhaps more to gain than others in improving the regeneration of local areas and reducing the degree of social exclusion. In general, virtually all companies benefit from being located in an area which has a flexible, educated and motivated workforce, is free from crime and social strife, has good communications and access and has an adequate supply of land, premises and social infrastructure. However, some private sector players can also benefit in other ways. Thus local retailers benefit directly from enhancements to local purchasing power that arise from reductions in the numbers on low incomes.

As an example of how difficult it is to secure "regeneration from within" it is now the case that a deprived locality of 10,000 to 15,000 residents will find it difficult to maintain a viable local shopping centre with a profitable anchor supermarket branch which is an important feature of community life. Such stores are viable either in a large town centre or out of town adjacent to the main road network. Such market stores are affecting the delivery mechanism of a wide range of private and public services so that increasing the costs of

travel out of the deprived locality for such services adds to the problems of social exclusion which exist within the deprived locality.

Another innovative policy response which would enhance the potential scale of private sector involvement would be to formally link areas of deprivation and social exclusion to nearby areas of opportunity - to assist both areas to best play their respective roles and in particular to assist the forging of links and interaction between the two. Thus the area of opportunity would be assisted to attract investment and create jobs and provide training for the residents of a nearby deprived area. The deprived area would receive regeneration assistance of a comprehensive kind as has tended to occur hitherto, and both areas would be assisted to forge direct links of all kinds between the two. These direct links would be of many kinds and include improved transport links as well as links between firms, organisations and community groups.

6.5 *More co-ordination and integration of policy*

The idea that the problems of geographical concentration of deprivation and social exclusion could be tackled by policies aimed only at the prevention of future problems would be intuitively attractive if the existing geographical pockets of existing disadvantage and deprivation were not so extensive or deep seated. Policies aimed only at prevention would leave existing deprived estates to deteriorate further at an increasing cost to the Exchequer and at an increasing risk of a total breakdown of social cohesion locally.

Some balance has to be struck between the prevention of future social exclusion emerging and the cure of existing serious and concentrated problem areas and groups of people.

In practice a fruitful approach to achieving this balance is to allocate the tasks of prevention to mainstream departments, programmes and agencies which operate nationally (including collectively the local authorities who deliver some of these policies) and where the task of prevention traditionally rightly belongs. These authorities have a joint statutory duty to provide a common (high) level of public service to all communities and in relation to their relative needs and to variations in the unit costs of delivering services.

Historically the departmental formulae and other administrative mechanisms for distributing funding resources to achieve this have been subject to imperfections and administrative and quality assurance mechanisms in many policy areas have been found wanting at a local level - including education, health, social services, training, social security, housing, town and country planning and transport. If all these mainstream programmes were operating as they should they would automatically tackle emerging problems e.g. poorly performing schools and prevent future widespread social exclusion from occurring and indeed many departments/agencies/local authorities are making determined efforts to do this.

However, where serious problems of concentrated multiple deprivation, physical decay and social exclusion have already emerged the experience has been that mainstream programmes have merely nibbled at the edges of the problem or compensated for the adverse symptoms of the problem rather than finding a sustained cure. The vertical chain of command in the British department/administrative structure of policy delivery is not ideal for taking co-ordinated flexible actions to meet the needs of problem areas. The mainstream programmes have to operate in these areas with a relatively high expenditure per head commensurate with their relative needs but all the evidence suggests that this is insufficient to provide a cure. It is the role of special area targeted comprehensive regeneration programmes to supplement mainstream programmes in providing the local institutional framework and top-up funding needed to find a cure.

In the light of the evidence presented in this paper there would seem to be strong advantages from achieving a more co-ordinated and integrated policy response between area targeted regeneration programmes and the more people orientated responses of the mainstream government departments. Such co-ordination could help to prevent new social exclusion occurring as well as helping to remove the very severe geographical concentrations which currently exist.

References

- A Framework with which to Evaluate the Achievements of the Single Regeneration Budget Bidding Round. Measuring and Interpreting the Baseline in the 20 SRB Case Studies. Brennan, A, Rhodes, J, and Tyler, P.
- An Examination of Unsuccessful Bids under the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund. Brennan, A, Rhodes, J, and Tyler, P.
- The Distribution of Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund Expenditure in Relation to Local Area Need in England. Brennan, A, Rhodes, J, and Tyler, P.
- Key Results from Residents' Baseline Social Surveys. Whitehead, C and Smith, L.
- An Interim Evaluation of the SRB Challenge Fund to be published by DETR in September 1998. Brennan, A, Rhodes, J, and Tyler, P.
- Regenerating London's Docklands. Rising East Volume 2, Number 2 (forthcoming).
- An examination of Baseline Issues. Brennan, A, Rhodes, J, and Tyler, P (forthcoming).

Annex : Survey methodology & Response Rates

A1 Methodology

This section outlines the research methodology used in the baseline surveys of residents in eight selected SRB Challenge Fund case study areas, plus two control areas.

Target Population

The target population was the **head of household** or their **partner/spouse** (defined in terms of whose name the home is owned or rented in) in households within the defined SRB and control areas. In Gillmoss and Bidston those targeted were parents or guardians of children aged 14-16 who attend specified schools - with the schools agreed with the SRB Partnership in Gillmoss, and defined as any school within the Wirral Metropolitan Borough in the control area of Bidston.

The sampling method used was a pre-selected random sample, where the addresses are selected from a defined sample frame. The sample generation is based on equal probabilities of inclusion, and interviewers were issued with contact sheets for each individual address at which they were permitted to call. Detailed information was recorded on this contact sheet by the interviewer, on the time and date of their calls and call-backs, as well as any comments.

Sample frame

The sample frame for the majority of areas was the Postal Address File (PAF), which contains each individual postal address and is updated by the Post Office every three months. The small users file was used, which contains mainly private addresses (those which receive less than 25 items of mail a day). PAF does give rise to some problems, since it contains around 10% of invalid addresses - either non-residential, or properties that no longer exist or are vacant. There is an added complication that it is a sample frame of addresses not households. Where there was more than one household per address (under 1% of interviewed households), the interviewer used a Kish grid to randomly select a household.

The sample areas were linked to the PAF by digitising Ordnance Survey maps of the areas outlined by the Partnerships in their bids and other documentation. In Gillmoss the initial stage was to take all the addresses in the Gillmoss Ward, from which a small number of Enumeration Districts on the fringe of the ward were removed in consultation with the Partnership. Street name listings were sent to the Partnerships to check the sample covered the correct areas.

In Chalkhill Estate and its control area St. Raphael’s Estate, the sample frame was a list of addresses (without names) provided by the London Borough of Brent.

Sample Selection

In the majority of areas, the samples were selected randomly from the above sample frames. In Swadlincote Woodlands and Sunderland the populations and geographical spread of the areas were too large to allow a straight random selection of addresses. For these two areas a random selection of Enumeration Districts were selected and addresses were randomly selected within these.

In Gillmoss and Bidston all addresses in the defined areas were issued to interviewers, to screen for the target group.

Statistical Reliability

The respondents to the questionnaire are only a sample of the total “population” in each area, so we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if everybody had been interviewed (the “true” values). We can, however, predict the variation between the sample results and the “true” values from a knowledge of the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that a particular answer is given. The confidence with which we can make this prediction is usually chosen to be 95% - that is, the chances are 95 in 100 that the “true” value will fall within a specified range.

The table below illustrates the predicted ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the “95% confidence interval”:

	Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
	+/-	+/-	+/-
100 interviews	6	9	10
400 interviews	3	5	5
450 interviews	3	4	5
500 interviews	3	4	4
600 interviews	2	4	4
3,500 interviews (7 main areas)	1	2	2
4,200 interviews (all areas)	1	1	2

For example, with a sample size of 600 completed interviews where 30% give a particular answer, the chances are 19 in 20 that the “true” value (which would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed) will fall within the range of +/- 4 percentage points from the sample result

When the results are compared between separate sub-groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be “real” or it may occur by chance (because not everyone in the population has been interviewed). To test if the difference is a real one - i.e. of it is “statistically significant”, we again have to know the size of the samples, the percentage giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. If we assume “95% confidence interval”, the differences between the two sub-sample results must be greater than the values given in the table below:

	Differences required for significance at or near these percentage levels		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
	+/-	+/-	+/-
100 and 400	7	10	11
100 and 500	6	10	11
100 and 4,200	6	9	10
400 and 500	4	6+	7
400 and 4,200	3	5	5
500 and 4,200	3	4	5

Pilot Survey

A pilot survey to test the survey materials and methodology was conducted in the Regency ward of Central Brighton, and Bestwood and Broxtowe Estates in Nottingham.

In total 32 interviews were conducted using four interviewers, with quotas set to ensure a spread of sex, age, employment status, tenure and the inclusion of families with children. The feedback from the interviewers was that the questionnaire worked reasonably well - with respondents interested in the content - but it also highlighted a number of issues which needed to be resolved.

The mean length for the pilot interviews was 56 minutes, with the average for individual interviewers ranging from 46 minutes to 63 minutes. The actual interview lengths ranged from 37 minutes to 70 minutes.

The interviewers were briefed by telephone prior to fieldwork and a face-to-face debrief session was held after, attended by representatives from the DoE, Cambridge University and the LSE.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was designed with the full involvement of the evaluation team and the Department of the Environment, with comments from other Government Departments sought before the pilot.

Fieldwork

For the main stage fieldwork, ten briefing sessions were conducted with the interviewers working on the survey. Full written instructions on all aspects of the survey were also given to each interviewer. All interviewers working on the survey were selected based on their experience of similar random, pre-selected projects.

Fieldwork was conducted between 8 November 1996 and 2 February 1997. Given the time of year, interviewer illness and an initially disappointing response rate, the fieldwork period was extended to allow existing addresses to be re-visited and reserve and new addresses issued. Each address received a minimum of four calls before being declared a non-contact, and given the extensive re-issuing of addresses, the majority received well in excess of four.

Editing

All interviewers were subject to a full edit on their first day's work and any systematic errors were fed back to the interviewer in question before they were allowed to continue interviewing. In addition, every questionnaire was manually edited on selected sections and questions.

At the data processing stage, a number of further checks were undertaken for logic, valid ranges and filtering, including the editing checks highlighted in the *Harmonised Concepts and Questions for Government Social Surveys* booklet, where appropriate.

Editing from Harmonised Concepts for Government Social Surveys

Edit checks were applied to the household data, following instructions in the *Harmonisation* booklet. Given the structure of the SRB questionnaire, in that it only recorded relationships of household members to the Head of the Household, rather than to all other household members, not all checks could be fully applied to all members of the household:

- parent/guardian should be older than child
- child should be younger than parent/guardian
- foster parent should be older than foster child
- foster child should be younger than foster parent
- grandparent should be older than grandchild
- grandchild should be younger than grandparent
- parent or grandparent should be older than 15 (soft check- check age)
- step/in-law-parent is usually older than their step-in-law-child (soft check)
- step-child/child-in-law is usually younger than their step/in-law-parent (soft check)

- married partner must be of opposite sex
- cohabiting partner is usually of opposite sex (soft check)
- recorded relationship as cohabited, but both partners' living arrangements are not cohabiting with someone currently living in household
- person is not married and not cohabiting so cannot have partner in household
- coded person as married but age is under 16 (soft check)
- coded person as cohabiting, but age is under 16 (soft check)
- household response person (Head of Household) may only have one (main) spouse or partner (soft check)

The following hard checks were applied to the income and benefits data:

- you cannot get guardian's allowance unless also claiming child benefit
- men are not eligible for NI Widow's Pension or Allowance

Weighting

Some time was spent considering weighting strategies, and three approaches were discussed and tested.

Strategy 1

Applying weights to each area based on population size of the SRB area:

Bradford	7%
Hangleton & Knoll	8%
Nottingham	19%
Rochdale	8%
Sunderland	32%
Swadlincote Woodlands	19%
Chalkhill	4%
St Raphaels	3%

However, given that equal samples were drawn for each area, this weighting strategy would have resulted in some heavy weights being applied, with the attendant biases of such an approach.

Strategy 2

Neutral weights applied so that each area has the same effect on the total figures. Again this was not felt to be an approximate weighting strategy.

Strategy 3

Finally there was the option of weighting key demographic variables (for example, age gender and ethnicity) back to census data. However, the census data are now six years old, and it is likely that SRB areas have a higher level of mobility than rural areas. Therefore it was felt that the proportions

identified in the MORI survey may actually be more accurate than the census data.

Test weights on selected variables were applied. However, given the methodological concerns of all three strategies, and the fact that the weights (except for Strategy 1) were having little impact on the results, it was decided to leave the data unweighted.

A2 Response Rates

The overall response rate was 64%, ranging from 51% in Hangleton & Knoll to 76% in Bradford.

In Chalkhill, St Raphael's, Hangleton & Knoll, Bradford, Rochdale and Nottingham 750 addresses were initially issued. In Swadlincote and Sunderland (given their ED based sample) 850 addresses were initially issued. In all areas the reserve addresses were also issued - 125 addresses in Swadlincote and Sunderland, 100 in the other areas. In Rochdale an additional 200 addresses were drawn and issued.

In Gillmoss 5,759 addresses were issued for census screening, with 4,626 issued in Bidston. The penetration rate of eligible households was lower than expected from 1991 Census statistics for each area - 1.9% in Gillmoss and 2.9% in Bidston - and the number of interviews achieved was lower.

Table A1 Numbers and Proportions of Interviews

	Numbers	% of all interviews	% main SRBs	Adjusted response rate
Chalkhill	465	11	13.4	61
St Raphaels (c)	512	12	-	68
Hangleton & Knoll	384	9	11.1	51
Bidston (c)	130	3	-	3
Gillmoss	97	2	-	2
Bradford	523	13	15.1	76
Rochdale	480	11	13.9	56
Swadlincote	605	14	17.5	69
Sunderland	564	13	16.3	66
Nottingham	438	10	12.7	66
7 main survey SRB (excluding Gillmoss)	3459	824	100	64
All areas	4198	100	100	

Detailed response rates

	Overall*	Chalkhill	St Raphaels	Hove	Bradford
Total Issued	7,250	850	850	850	850
Successful	3,971	465	512	384	523
Unadjusted response rate	55%	55%	60%	45%	62%
Occupant away/ill	142	21	14	29	12
Address vacant	427	50	31	21	76
Address non-residential	121	0	0	10	16
Address not found	43	1	1	2	2
Language	22	5	2	1	0
Other	281	13	51	27	60
Valid addresses	6,214	760	751	760	684
<i>Adjusted response rate</i>	<i>64%</i>	<i>61%</i>	<i>68%</i>	<i>51%</i>	<i>76%</i>
Refusals	1,393	115	138	303	113
<i>Non-contact</i>	<i>850</i>	<i>180</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>48</i>
Refusal rate	22%	15%	18%	40%	17%
Non-contact rate	14%	24%	13%	10%	6%

* Excluding Bidston and Gillmoss

	Rochdale	Swadlincote	Sunderland	Nottingham
Total Issued	1050	975	975	850
Successful	480	605	564	438
Unadjusted response rate	46%	62%	58%	52%
Occupant away/ill	20	14	19	13
Address vacant	72	56	43	78
Address non-residential	44	8	11	32
Address not found	14	6	8	9
Language	7	0	0	7
Other	38	9	40	43
Valid addresses	855	882	854	668
<i>Adjusted response rate</i>	<i>56%</i>	<i>69%</i>	<i>66%</i>	<i>66%</i>
Refusals	216	189	193	126
<i>Non-contact</i>	<i>159</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>104</i>
Refusal rate	25%	21%	23%	19%
Non-contact rate	19%	10%	11%	16%

Response Rates (cont'd)

	Bidston	Gillmoss
Total Issued	4,626	5,759
Successful	130	97
Unadjusted response rate	2.8%	1.7%
Occupant away/ill	3	4
Address vacant	64	418
Address non-residential	24	60
Address not found	44	55
Language	0	0
Other	41	82
Valid addresses	4,450	5,140
<i>Adjusted response rate</i>	<i>2.9%</i>	<i>1.9%</i>
Ineligible households	4,140	4,932
Refused screening	17	16
Refused main	45	24
Non-contact	118	71

